

From: <neil_toronto@hotmail.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 11:38 AM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Neil Toronto
ADDRESS: 49 South, 200 West Apt. B-2
Lehi, UT 84043

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping.

Please remember that copyright law (and therefore forms of copy protection) exist, in the end, to benefit society as a whole - not necessarily the corporations who claim to represent the artists who create the works. Giving an artist complete control of his work for a limited time gives him incentive to create, therefore benefiting society.

If the law sides with the corporation that claims to represent the artist at the expense of consumers' rights, the law is not correct, and is in violation of the spirit of copyright. Please do not entertain restrictions that will infringe upon the rights of consumers.

Sincerely,
Neil Toronto

From: <loldanach@iname.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 8:54 AM
Subject: VCR's: MPAA vs HRRC

FROM:

NAME: Jeff Morton
ADDRESS: 31 Woodlake Rd #7
Albany, NY 12203

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I'm rather surprised that the FCC has been asked to review this question again. This is nearly identical to the situation reviewed in the early 80's, when VCR's were being examined for their time shifting abilities.

At the time, they represented the best recording resolution available to the average home viewer. Now, the best recording resolution would be from digital signals, and the MPAA yet again believes that it would be best served by not allowing anyone to copy. Barring that, they want to place restrictions on the ability of an end-viewer to copy.

The MPAA is not interested in the rights of copyright holders, they're interested in maintaining their ability to control the viewer's habits, and time shifting circumvents that ability.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey R Morton

From: <pstemari@well.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 9:09 AM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Paul Ste. Marie
ADDRESS: 437 Sharon Court
Middletown, OH 45042

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. The courts have clearly ruled that this is nonsense.

Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with copyright infringement. Fair use is an important part of copyright law and the technical means to enable fair use must be protected.

In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Ste. Marie

From: <jkanowi@siue.edu>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 9:15 AM
Subject: MPAA vs. HRRC - Don't copy-protect broadcasts!

FROM:

NAME: Joseph Kanowitz
ADDRESS: Cougar Village Apt. 514-2A
Edwardsville, IL 62025

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

In reference to the recent Slashdot article, I'd like to voice my opinion regarding copy-protection (and similar techniques) on digital media.

First of all, it should be obvious that consumers ("Consumers?" How about taxpayers? Do we lose our rights as citizens simply because we don't have a corporate backing and an acronym?) should have the right to manipulate information that is broadcast to them. Andy Warhol did this with his soup cans, consumers do this with their VCRs (albeit in a less creative way), etc. I'm of the opinion that if something is broadcast, especially by wireless means, I should have the right to intercept that signal and do what I will with it provided I'm not reselling/redistributing it in an illegal manner. (It should be noted that the current law does NOT provide for this, in that it's illegal to purchase equipment which can intercept the cellular band, etc...)

If information is being thrown at me (and I would say that this is the definition of 'broadcast'), I had best have the right to receive and manipulate it as I choose, with what equipment I choose. You'll notice that I am not talking about *consuming* a broadcast, since a broadcast is not a product I go out and buy- it is a broadcast, and in the case of an RF broadcast, it's a wave propagating through the space I happen to inhabit.

Okay, that's a bit hippie of me to say. Let's assume that the "consumer product" analogy is too well-entrenched to be modified. If I go out and buy a product, I should be allowed to take it apart and poke screwdrivers into it, right? That's my right as a consumer- can someone refuse to sell me a TV because I will smash it? Similarly, if I choose to "consume" a broadcast, I should have the right to tinker with it, view the signal on a spectrum analyzer if I want, /or record it for later playback./ That's my right as a consumer- a corporation should not be able to dictate what I can do, simply because they have more money than I do.

If there were true competition in the television/broadcast industry, there wouldn't be a problem here- as a consumer, I could choose to only consume from the broadcaster which does not encrypt/copy-protect their transmissions. However, there is not competition because the limited nature of the RF spectrum (and thus the necessity for licensing and bandplans) precludes this, and I am

not granted this choice. I'm not happy about the decision to give each existing broadcaster 4x480i (thus giving them 3 more channels for free), and I'll be doubly unhappy if I can't record The Simpsons if I'm not around when the show is on- and triply unhappy if I can't choose what medium I want to record on (analog tape, CD-ROM, DVD-ROM, FMD-ROM, magnetoptical, digital tape, stone tablets, whatever)...

I know the MPAA and other lobbyists are going to be paying well to get this passed through, but don't let that smother common sense.

-Joe Kanowitz

From: <andrew@andybent.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 9:32 AM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Andrew Bent
ADDRESS: 32 Reservoir Road
Coventry, RI 02816

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

It is a fair and true practice that every artist or producer may have some control over what they have created.

However, there is a great difference between what is shown in an exclusive location (i.e. art museum, movie theater or concert venue) and what is publically broadcast through any medium (i.e. Television, Radio or Internet) In these cases, an individual consents to an exclusively partake of a media without an ownership or expectation of control. When the owner of a form of media chooses to broadcast his or her work, he or she relinquishes part of the control that her or she has over it to the people that it is being broadcast to.

Ownership is an important concept. But when an owner uses their position to control people in any way, it becomes a very dangerous thing.

From: <feets@mindspring.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 9:38 AM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Harvey Simmons
ADDRESS: 1401 Mallard Drive
DeSoto, TX 75115

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding.

As a new digital cable subscriber, I am enjoying the service, however, the MPAA's views are, in my opinion, repressive and outdated. Thank you for reading my views.

Sincerely,

Harvey B. Simmons, Jr.

From: <sluzynsk@utilicorp.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 9:38 AM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Steve Luzynski
ADDRESS: 924 SW Speas Drive
Blue Springs, MO 64014

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

It has been made known that the FCC has been asked to rule on a request from the MPAA (amongst others) to force copy protection equipment to be added to VCRs. The studios are apparently concerned that digital cable will allow for easier theft of cable service. I am writing to voice my concern over this action.

Since the first VCRs were made available, the Supreme Court has ruled that taping programs for personal use - time-shifting a program that is shown at an inconvenient time, for example - constitutes fair use under existing Copyright law. I find the studio's assumption that every US citizen is a criminal waiting to steal from them to be offensive. My desire to watch a football game broadcast at the same time as another game I also want to watch does not make me a thief.

Thank you for your time.
Sincerely,
Steve Luzynski

From: <scott@nami.org>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 9:40 AM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Scott Johnson
ADDRESS: 3001 Park Center Apt 1113
Alexandria, VA 22302

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

PLEASE CONTINUE TO ALLOW HOME RECORDING!

Sincerely,

Scott Johnson

From: <pll@mclinux.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 9:56 AM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Paul Lussier
ADDRESS: 226 Page Street
Lunenburg, MA 01462

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed.

Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service!

This country is each and every day becoming more and more of a Police State. Ironically though, Big Brother is not in the form of renegade government officials, but rather, the very companies and corporations fighting to gain total control over the very capitalist practices this free country was founded upon. Nothing is sacred any longer but the almighty dollar. As long as there is a way Big Brother/Business can squeeze more money out of the average consumer, they will stop at absolutely nothing to accomplish this end. This evidently includes stripping people of the freedoms this country was founded upon.

Please keep in mind, that each time a law is passed in favor of Big Business, and it takes away a right we previously held, you are also hurting yourselves. If this law is passed, not only does it mean that average people can no longer record television programming at their own discretion, but that also means that *you* personally will be affected in the same manner.

In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

Sincerely,
Paul Lussier
A Quite Concerned Citizen

From: <bill.marble@fidelity.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 10:05 AM
Subject: MPAA attempts to limit home copying

FROM:

NAME: William Marble
ADDRESS: 49 Church Street
Northborough, MA 01532

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I have read recently that the MPAA is trying to get the FCC to force the modification of home entertainment equipment in such a way that "some" digital content will not be recordable for later viewing.

Didn't the Supreme Court already deal with this issue 20 years ago? Home copying for later viewing is legal and I don't see why the fact that the signal is arriving in digital form should change that.

Let's also address the MPAA's assertion that only some content would be restricted. Okay, which content? Pay-per-view events? If I pay my \$50 why can't I record it and view it later? HBO premier movies? If I pay \$20 per month for the signal, why should I have to be awake and watching certain movies or event programs when I own a VCR?

The MPAA would argue that since "a majority" of the content would not be restricted that consumers will not be adversely affected. Boloney. Which shows? When? How do I find out? How do I know in advance which shows I have to watch and which I can record?

In my opinion, the MPAA is up to its old tricks again. They are claiming that some new technology will result in copying on such a wide scale as to leave their entire industry in ruins. They made this claim 20 years ago in a very similar suit and lost, which is fortunate for them since they have since made billions of dollars from the sale of movies on tape.

Just because a new technology makes quality copying possible does not mean the vast majority of people are going to start creating or consuming pirated content. Most people use VCRs to watch rented movies and record programs for later viewing, and most don't record very often. What should be considered is not the total number of programs that won't be restricted, but the number of restricted programs as a percentage of the total a person wants to record. If I would normal record 50 programs a year but under the new rules 20 of those programs are restricted by the MPAA, I would argue that there is a significant impact. And for what? All I wanted to do was watch the Academy Awards without having to stay up 'til midnight.

If someone copies a broadcast and rebroadcasts it, or has a public showing with an admission charge, or makes copies that he makes available for sale then that person has broken the law and should be prosecuted. But I don't want my fair use rights to copy for later viewing the programming I've paid for to be restricted because someone somewhere *might* decide to use the new technology to more efficiently break existing copyright laws.

And what about people who have already shelled out \$5,000 or more for digital televisions? Is the MPAA going to reimburse them? Or is that another case where there is going to be "minimal impact."

If they really want to protect their content, they shouldn't broadcast it.

Sincerely,

William Marble

From: <cmcfarland@bigfoot.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 7:41 AM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Chris McFarland
ADDRESS: 3943 Camrose Pl
Marietta, GA 30062

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. I believe that ALL copy protection should end once the program enters my house. I have the right to time-shift any program to when I wish to watch it.

Thank you for reading my views.

Sincerely,
Chris McFarland

From: <dubby@neo.rr.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 7:45 AM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Hallie Reardon
ADDRESS: 1414 Lancelot Drive
Streetsboro, OH 44241

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

It is my understanding the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service!

I resent the constant implications, made by the entertainment industry, and especially, the MPAA, that my use of time shifting, so that I may enjoy programing that is only aired during the times that I am working, on the cable system that I pay monthly to access, is in anyway copyright infringement or "piracy". I have used my VCR, for only lawful purposes, for over twenty years and by taking away my right to fair use, as defined under the law, the FCC does not serve my interests or the interests of my fellow citizens.

It is the mandate of FCC to protect the rights of all Americans, not simply the interests of well-financed special interest groups!

Sincerely,

Hallie E. Reardon

From: <robin@roblimo.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 7:50 AM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Robin Miller
ADDRESS: 6665 Aspern Dr.
Elkridge, MD 21075

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

Letting the MPAA and others of their ilk decide what material I can and can't record on my home recording equipment for my personal use is not a good idea. I understand their desire to extract every dollar they can from their customers, but please don't forget that material broadcast over the airwaves makes use of a public facility, and material broadcast over cable TV systems makes use of public rights of way and easements that allow cable companies to place their equipment on private property (including mine) without permission.

I also understand how tempting it must be for members of the Commission to do the bidding of broadcasters who can offer you big-money jobs tomorrow in exchange for doing their bidding today. Please try to fight this temptation. You'll feel better in the end.

In general, allowing those who provide content to either cable or over-the-air broadcasters to dictate the mechanical specifications of home viewing and recording equipment is a bad idea. I must ask you not to allow them to do this.

Besides, any such restrictions will be circumvented almost immediately, thereby creating a huge "grey market" for non-disabled TVs, recording devices, and PC video capture cards that you will not be able to stop and will look foolish for having helped create.

Thank you for listening,

- Robin Miller
citizen and co-owner,
The United States of America

From: <matt_willett@yahoo.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 8:06 AM
Subject: Re: PP Docket No. 00-67 and the FCC in general

FROM:

NAME: Matthew Willett
ADDRESS: 85 East India Row
Boston, MA 02110

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

If you don't stop acting like you work for corporate America and start paying attention to simple things like what the public thinks, you will become as loathed as the IRS (which I estimate has about 10 years of existence left to it). PAY ATTENTION!

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

From: <marco_panzanella@pall.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 8:06 AM
Subject: MPAA's proposal to stop home recordings on VCRs

FROM:

NAME: Marco Panzanella
ADDRESS: 3669 US State route 281
Cortland, NY 13045

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I find it very disturbing that the MPAA is trying to regulate exactly how I view television. They seem to want total control over my viewing habits. I do not wish to have to view a program at a time they wish; my schedule does not allow for it. I would rather tape it for later viewing and for the ability to fast forward through commercials.

Banning this ability would also limit current fair use clauses. Don't set a precedent by banning personal home recording.

From: <jbellamy@engineer.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 8:16 AM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Josh BellamY
ADDRESS: 4701 Charles Pl. Apt 2635
Plano, TX 75093

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service!

Please do not allow Big Business to swallow the rights of the consumers. The MPAA will not rest until fair use is their use. As a consumer, I should be able to view the material of my choice on any medium I wish, at a time that is convenient for me. Being an educated technophile does not make me a pirate/thief.

In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

Sincerely,

Josh Bellamy

From: <jadrakey@hotmail.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 8:21 AM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: John Drakey
ADDRESS: 9910 Floyd
Overland Park , KS 66212

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

This is getting out of hand. Some level of common sense must be seen here. The Digital Millenium Copy Right Act is out of line and should be looked at very carefully.

Thank you.

From: <evan@lavidor.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 8:38 AM
Subject: PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Evan Lavidor
ADDRESS: 24 Main Street
Somerville, MA 02145

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service. In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding.

If the FCC and the MPAA wants to regulate the use of digitally delivered programming, then the signals should be used to prevent the re-recording of material. For example, since I've paid for my cable programming, I should be able to tape it using my VCR for later viewing. This is the basic principle of cable tv service as well as how most people use their VCR's. However, a digitally delivered program cannot be recorded from the tape which recorded it in the first place.

Perhaps this solution would placate the powers that be. It would allow for proper use of one's own equipment, while taking steps to prevent the illegal distribution of copyrighted material.

Thank you for hearing my views on this matter.

Sincerely,

Evan Lavidor

From: <loldanach@iname.com>
To: DC.CMGI(AKitey)
Date: Wed, Sep 6, 2000 8:54 AM
Subject: VCR's: MPAA vs HRRC

FROM:

NAME: Jeff Morton
ADDRESS: 31 Woodlake Rd #7
Albany, NY 12203

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

Copy of message text follows:

I'm rather surprised that the FCC has been asked to review this question again. This is nearly identical to the situation reviewed in the early 80's, when VCR's were being examined for their time shifting abilities.

At the time, they represented the best recording resolution available to the average home viewer. Now, the best recording resolution would be from digital signals, and the MPAA yet again believes that it would be best served by not allowing anyone to copy. Barring that, they want to place restrictions on the ability of an end-viewer to copy.

The MPAA is not interested in the rights of copyright holders, they're interested in maintaining their ability to control the viewer's habits, and time shifting circumvents that ability.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey R Morton